

Subject: Ed

Source : Dr M

Date : 9 Oct 1966

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
VAZ WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. Source met with Subject at the latter's home in Roubaix from 10.30 to 14.00 hrs on 23 Aug 1966. Source was told that Subject got his scholarship confirmed for another year and this will be his last ~~one~~ in Kiev. The scholarship was arranged through the French Foreign Office ( Quai d'Orsay) with virtually no support from French professors of Slavistics. Of course, he had some encouragement from various Slavistical circles and particularly from Prof Mason. Subject's PhD - thesis was progressing, he discussed it just again with his supervisor Madame Scherer. He also saw Zhukovsky Arkadiy while in Paris. After his return from Kiev Subject hoped to get a lectureship with Prof LUCIANI'S faculty at Bordeaux University.

On 25 Aug 1966 Subject was leaving for Kiev and that's why he could not visit Source in Paris but instead asked him to come to his place. Subject hoped to be back in France for Christmas vacations, most probably in Jan 1967. On that occasion they will meet again.

2. Subject brought for Dr M an old book on H. Skovoroda by H. Khotkevych, published in 1920 in Kharkiv which Ivan DZIUBA had found for Source among secondhand booksellers. Subject brought also for Source Na yarmarku vitriy by Petro Zasenka, Sole na Solfi by Irena Zhylenko, and Zalizniaky by S. Telniuk.

From Source he took the following books for his friends in Kiev : Na bahriianomu kona revolutsiyi  
Budivnychyi Pershoyi Ukrainskoyi Respubliki  
8 issues of Suchasnist for 1966

Subject also took some books of his own, mainly on philosophy.

*Handwritten:*  
Kiev  
124.24/3 ✓

*Handwritten:*  
124.24/3 ✓

DZIUBA asked him to bring as many books as possible, particularly he wanted to have modern philosophers (Jaspers, Sartre, Heidegger).

3. Subject was seeing DZIUBA quite frequently. They were good friends. DZIUBA was not arrested, only interrogated and relieved of his job. Recently he was given a secondary job which was not in line with his interest. Dziuba's health was quite all right. He concentrates now on the fight against the Russification. In this connection Subject asked Source whether he knew Dziuba's memorandum or rather treatise on the Russification ~~conducted by Moscow~~ in the Ukraine. Source replied that he had heard about it and wanted to know whether Subject had a copy with him. No - was reply but Subject kept it for several days in Kiev and read it thoroughly. Subject hoped that it will soon reach abroad just "as the other things have done". At this moment Subject asked Source whether he knew Wolfram BURGHARDT who could tell him much about the treatise <sup>Dziuba</sup> and other things. Source did not know whether Burghardt stopped in Paris on his way from the Ukraine.

Dziuba's treatise is called "Internationalism or Greatpower Chauvinism". It analyses Leninist nationalities policy and from its positions attacks present Soviet policy in the Ukraine by outlining in quite a detail all its demographic, cultural, economic, and political aspects. A large part of the treatise is devoted to historical analysis.

Together with a protesting letter this treatise was sent to CC CP Ukraine and to the Government of the Ukr SSR. So far Dziuba received no reply. The treatise is widely known among literati, students, and intelligentsia in general.

Dziuba is contemplating to eventually re-edit it and try to publish.

4. The arrests and trials have stopped. The trials were closed only sentences were usually read in open sessions. In Kiev and Lviv many literati were sentenced. About the trial in LUTSK he could not say much but knew there was one. Those sentenced to 4-6 years were not most known.

In general, most famous writers and poets were spared. Subject thought it was deliberate, there was no doubt as to feelings and sympathies of those young literati who were subjected to "general" harassment only.

Such people as DRACH Ivan was in a particularly critical situation. His film has been produced but Subject doubted he will be run on screens. Incidentally, Subject saw Drach's film, it was very modern, even for Western taste.

KOSTENKO Lina was also "spared" but suffered much from interrogations and other harassment. She was working on a film, too, but as Subject learned shortly before his departure from Kiev, she encountered some new obstacles and he doubted she would ever finish it.

The trials of intellectuals gave cause to many protests, particularly in Kiev and Lviv. In Subject's opinion, there is in Kiev a young very dynamic group of intellectuals who "are moving things all the time". The bulk of intellectuals, including students, however, are frightened by new refined measures of pressure and persecution. Those participating in demonstration are being photographed, identified, and usually expelled from universities and schools. DRACH himself is a victim of a demonstration that has taken place a few years ago. And so he remained "unfinished" student until now. As far as Subject could remember DRACH laid a wreath on Shevchenko Monument in Kiev on some occasion and next day he was expelled from University.

Still, Subject was amazed by the powerful demonstration and protests that followed the trials of intellectuals, and which were mainly conducted by young people.

BAZHAN remained "neutral", he did not engage himself in protesting activities. Also KOROTYCH sat on the fence as he had done in the past. Subject did not trust him and avoided closer friendship with him. As to other elder literati Subject doubted there was a real effort on their part to become actively involved in protests.

5. The Dzugalo-affair was a great disappointment for everybody.

Subject complained about the fact that there were no Western diplomatic missions in Kiev. Also no adequate other communication media with the capital of Ukraine. In his opinion the West <sup>was missing</sup> many things by not covering "Ukrainian field". Of course, some embassies in Moscow are quite well informed about what is going on in the Ukraine, so is, for instance, the French Embassy, but it would be much better if they were "on the very spot". At least correspondents should be stationed permanently in Kiev.

6. Subject had strong doubts about the authorities' willingness to promote young literati' travels abroad. On the contrary, they will probably limit them to a minimum. Thus PARADZANOV was not let to <sup>go to</sup> France. Most probably, only trusted, second rate garbatur will be let out from time-to-time.

7. Subject's friends in Kiev paid much attention to General de Gaulle's visit to Kiev. They expected some political gains from it or at least establishment of closer cultural contacts between Ukraine and France. After de Gaulle's visit they were quite disappointed because their expectation did not materialize.

Subject was told by someone in Kiev that when General de Gaulle passed by the Shevchenko Monument he asked the driver to stop and laid flowers at the Monument.

[illegible]

8. DRACH Ivan complained to Subject about KRAVTSIV Bondan. Also Lina KOSTENKO told him that it was better to avoid any political comments when writing about people in the Ukraine. Afavarobla appraisal abroad meant putting one or the other writer automatically on a black list.

But the main thing was not to write about political aspects of individual works.

9. Source will correspond with Subject as usually - through Quai d'Orsay. Subject mentioned that all his mail was being read by the French.

10. Subject is working now on an anthology of modern French poetry to be published in Ukrainian. He will write introduction and biographic notes himself. KOCHUR Hryhori , DZIUBA Ivan, and others are helping him now in his work.